



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,555	02/26/2004	Masaaki Takata	249353US3	3248
22850	7590	04/05/2006	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				LUND, JEFFRIE ROBERT
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1763		

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

S

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/786,555	TAKATA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,  
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/05</u>.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</li> <li>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</li> <li>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</li> </ol>
---	--

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beatty et al, US Patent 6,692,249 B1.

Beatty et al teaches a thermal treatment system that includes an outer tube 12 made of silicon carbide that has a closed upper portion; an open lower portion; and a flange formed on an outer peripheral side of the lower portion. The lower portion has a tapered portion so as to expand a diameter thereof toward the lower end. (See figures 1-3) For clarity the Examiner has attached a blown up portion of figure 2, which is similar to figures 1 and 3.

Beatty et al differs from the present invention in that Beatty et al does not teach specific dimensions of the outer tube (i.e. size, radii of curvature, surface roughness, etc).

The providing dimensions for an apparatus is a fundamental engineering skill and is part of applying the disclosures of patents, which rarely give specific dimensions. Furthermore, it was held in *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984), by the Federal Circuit that, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a

Art Unit: 1763


recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device. (Also see MPEP 2144.04

(d)) If the apparatus of Beatty et al were made to the dimensions taught in the specification, it would have all of the claimed ratios.

The motivation for making the apparatus of Beatty et al to the specific dimensions of the specification is to provide specific dimensions from which to manufacture the apparatus of Beatty et al as required by Beatty et al.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide specific dimension from which to manufacture the apparatus of Beatty et al.

Blown up portion of figure 2



***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed January 12, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regard to the arguments that Beatty et al has not recognized any of the claimed relationships, and therefore Beatty et al cannot be optimized, the Examiner agrees. However, the applicant has misunderstood the rejection, in that the Examiner is not suggesting that the structure be optimized as argued. Rather, the Examiner is suggesting that the apparatus that Beatty et al has the same structure as the claimed invention but does not provide any specific dimensions, and if Beatty et al were made to the same dimensions it would meet all of the claimed ratios. Thus, it is not an optimization or modification of the structure of Beatty et al, but merely supplying the required dimensions to build the apparatus of Beatty et al. The rejection has been amended clarified this point.

In regard to the argument that "Applicants' disclosure proves that the claimed outer tube does, in fact, perform differently than the known, prior art outer tube" and supports this argument with the two examples provided in the specification, the Examiner disagrees. The "prior art" described is that shown in Figure 4. This tube is not the same as the tube of Beatty et al. Therefore the argument is moot because the Applicant is comparing the present invention to a different "prior art" tube. For this argument to be valid, applicant must show that the present invention performs differently than the apparatus of Beatty et al made using the disclosed dimensions.

**Conclusion**

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited art teaches the technological background of the invention. The cited art contains patents that could be used to reject the claims under 35 USC § 103. These rejections have not been made because they do not provide any additional or different teachings, and if they were applied, would have resulted in an undue multiplication or references. (See MPEP 707.07(g)) Yamaga et al, US Patent 5,578,132 (figure 11) and Ahlgren, US Patent 4,985,281 could be used to make rejections similar to the rejection under Beatty et al.


5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrie R. Lund whose telephone number is (571) 272-1437. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (6:30 am-6:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on (571) 272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jeffrie R. Lund  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1763

JRL  
4/2/06